



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,095	12/01/2000	Dario de Judicibus	GB920000002US1	4536

7590 10/03/2002

Derek S. Jennings  
IBM Corporation, I.P. Law Dept.  
T. J. Watson Research Center  
P.O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/728,095

Applicant(s)

JUDICIBUS, DARIO DE

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

DOV POPOVICI

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

DOV POPOVICI

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 9, line 5: "attribute to changed to" should be --attribute to change to--.

Correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knutson et al (U.S. patent No. 5,870,746) in view of Balabine et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,406.)

As to claim 1, Knutson et al teaches a system which is responsive to a query, comprising at least one conditional attribute and at least one attribute to be displayed, to produce an associated report comprising one or more objects, each object comprising the at least one displayed attributes (see Abstract), the system comprising:

first means for rendering at least one object from a report (see column 2, lines 20-25, and see column 18, lines 16-22, where "object from a report" is read on "segment");

first means, responsive to user interaction with the rendered report (see column 6, lines 56-62), for selecting one or more displayed attributes and causing the one or more displayed attributes to change to respective one or more conditional attributes (see column 8, line 65

Art Unit: 2175

through column 9, line 9, where “conditional attributes” is read on “the relationship between measures and the constraints placed upon them”);

second means for rendering at least one conditional attribute for a query (see column 16, lines 38-54);

second means, responsive to user interaction with the one or more rendered conditional attributes, for selecting one or more conditional attributes and causing the one or more conditional attributes to change to respective one or more displayed attributes (see column 27, lines 39-47);

means, responsive to the conditional and displayed attributes, for generating a subsequent query (see column 64, lines 44-65.)

Knutson et al does not teach a system cooperable with a data engine.

Balabine et al teaches a file system interface to a database (see Abstract), in which he teaches a system cooperable with a data engine (see column 5, lines 55-64.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knutson et al to include a system cooperable with a data engine.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knutson et al by the teaching of Balabine et al, because having a system cooperable with a data engine enables the system CPU to interact with the database independent of the network protocol and be able to provide the functionality for creating and deleting tables within the memory.

As to claim 2, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the data engine is a database (see Knutson et al, column 2, lines 20-28) and the query is an SQL query (see Knutson et al, column 6, lines 35-36, also see column 7, lines 11-15.)

As to claim 3, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the data engine is a simulation tool (see Balabine et al, column 7, lines 13-19, where “simulation” is read on “emulates a file system”.)

As to claim 4, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first and second selecting means comprise respective means for navigating through the one or more attributes to select a single conditional or displayed attribute to be changed (see Knutson et al, column 8, line 65 through column 9, line 9, and see column 19, lines 16-17.)

As to claim 5, Knutson et al as modified teaches the system comprising:  
means, responsive to user interaction with a selected conditional attribute, for determining a value of the selected conditional attribute (see Knutson et al, column 5, lines 32-39) to be used as a condition in the subsequent query (see Knutson et al, column 13, lines 27-36.)

As to claim 6, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the value comprises a complex expression (see Knutson et al, column 3, lines 58-65, where “complex expression” is read on “expression that restricts the value”.)

As to claim 7, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the determining means is responsive to user interaction to determine an adjusted value of the selected attribute's value as the condition (see Knutson et al, column 16, lines 1-8.)

As to claim 8, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first navigation means is responsive to user interaction to cause the selected displayed attribute to change to a conditional attribute and the second navigation means is responsive to user interaction to cause the selected conditional attribute to change to a displayed attribute (see Knutson et al, column 16, lines 38-54, where “changing of attributes” is taught by using “system templates”.)

As to claim 9, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first and second selecting means are responsive to user interaction to cause all conditional attributes to change to displayed attributes and to cause all displayed attributes to changed to conditional attributes (see Knutson et al, column 16, lines 38-54, where “changing of attributes” is taught by using “system templates”.)

As to claim 10, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first rendering means is adapted to initially display all objects from a report associated with a query (see Knutson et al, column 11, lines 12-19.)

As to claim 11, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first rendering means is adapted to display the objects in a table (see Knutson et al, figure 6, and see column 11, lines 20-22.)

As to claim 12, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the first rendering means is adapted to display the objects isometrically (see Knutson et al, column 6, line 63 through column 7, line 2, where “dimensional queries for display format” is taught.)

As to claim 13, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the second rendering means is adapted to display the attributes isometrically (see Knutson et al, column 6, line 63 through column 7, line 2, where “dimensional queries for display format” is taught.)

As to claim 14, Knutson et al as modified teaches the system comprising means for receiving user input corresponding to at least a portion of a first query (see Knutson et al, column 25, line 50 through column 26, line 24.)

As to claim 15, Knutson et al as modified teaches wherein the receiving means comprises one of a natural language interface, a text entry field or a query-by-example analyzer (see Knutson et al, column 15, lines 48-52, and see column 16, lines 65-67.)

As to claim 16, Knutson et al teaches a method which is responsive to a query, comprising at least one conditional attribute and at least one attribute to be displayed, to produce an associated report comprising one or more objects, each object comprising the at least one displayed attributes (see Abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2175

rendering at least one object from a report (see column 2, lines 20-25, and see column 18, lines 16-22, where “object from a report” is read on “segment”);

responsive to user interaction with the rendered report (see column 6, lines 56-62), selecting one or more displayed attributes and causing the one or more displayed attributes to change to respective one or more conditional attributes (see column 8, line 65 through column 9, line 9, where “conditional attributes” is read on “the relationship between measures and the constraints placed upon them”);

rendering at least one conditional attribute for a query (see column 16, lines 38-54);

responsive to user interaction with the one or more rendered conditional attributes, selecting one or more conditional attributes and causing the one or more conditional attributes to change to respective one or more displayed attributes (see column 27, lines 39-47);

responsive to the conditional and displayed attributes, generating a subsequent query (see column 64, lines 44-65.)

Knutson et al does not teach a method operable with a data engine.

Balabine et al teaches a file system interface to a database (see Abstract), in which he teaches a method operable with a data engine (see column 5, lines 55-64.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knutson et al to include a method operable with a data engine.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knutson et al by the teaching of Balabine et al, because having a method operable with a data engine enables the system CPU to interact with the



Art Unit: 2175

database independent of the network protocol and be able to provide the functionality for creating and deleting tables within the memory.

As to claim 17, Knutson et al as modified teaches a computer program product comprising computer program code stored on a computer readable storage medium for, when executed on a computing device, allowing a user to refine a query, the program code comprising the system of claim 1 (see Knutson et al, column 2, lines 20-37, and see column 7, lines 38-52.)

### *Conclusion*

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to data queries, data manipulations, and database interactions in general:

U.S. Patent No. 5,630,122 to Kaplan et al.

U.S. Patent No. 5,634,009 to Iddon et al.


5. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2175

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

September 18, 2002

  
DOV POPOVICI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100